## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

ALICE H. ALLEN, et al.

\*

V

\*

DAIRY FARMERS OF AMERICA, \*

INC., et al. \* CI

\* CIVIL FILE NO. 09-230

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE Thursday, May 5, 2016 Burlington, Vermont

## **BEFORE:**

THE HONORABLE CHRISTINA R. REISS Chief District Judge

## APPEARANCES:

BRENT W. JOHNSON, ESQ., EMMY L. LEVENS, ESQ., and KIT A. PIERSON, ESQ., Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

ROBERT G. ABRAMS, ESQ., DANYLL W. FOIX, ESQ., BakerHostetler LLP, Washington Square, Suite 1100, 1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.; Attorney for the Plaintiffs

Appearances Cont'd...

ANNE NICHOLS PIERCE
Registered Professional Reporter
United States District Court
Post Office Box 5633
Burlington, Vermont 05402
(802) 860-2227

## APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

STEVEN R. KUNEY, ESQ. Williams & Connolly LLP, 725 Twelfth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Attorney for Defendant Dairy Farmers of America, Inc.

DANIEL J. SMITH, ESQ., Northeast Dairy Compact Commission Executive Director, 16 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont; Attorney for the Intervenors

RICHARD T. CASSIDY, ESQ. and MATTHEW M. SHAGAM, ESQ., Hoff Curtis, 100 Main Street, Burlington, Vermont; Attorneys for the Intervenors

\*\*\* \*\* \*\*\*

ANNE NICHOLS PIERCE
Registered Professional Reporter
United States District Court
Post Office Box 5633
Burlington, Vermont 05402
(802) 860-2227

1 | THURSDAY, MAY 5, 2016

(The following was held in open court at 3:35 p.m.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, the matter before the Court is civil case number 09-CV-230, Alice H. Allen, et al. versus Dairy Farmers of America, et al. Present for the plaintiffs on the telephone are Robert Abrams, Emmy Levens, Brent Johnson, Danyll Foix, Kit Pierson, Daniel Smith, Richard Cassidy and Matthew Shagam. Present for defendant is Steven Kuney via telephone.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. So you wanted to speak to me, and that's fine. We don't have great luck with the telephone, but one thing that makes it easier is that if you identify yourself each time you speak, even if I know your voice it's not guaranteed that the court reporter's going to know your voice. So tell me what you would like me to hear.

MR. PIERSON: Thank you, your Honor. This is Kit Pierson. And personally, thank you very much for doing this on short notice.

You know, we, as you can imagine, the lawyers, have been talking about the logistical issues presented by sort of the flood of letters and the number of people that have indicated they would like to speak at the hearing, and we wanted to really contact you about two

things. One was to let you know some information that we're pulling together in pretty short order that will be provided to the Court that I think will help with the logistics, and I will explain what that information is.

And then we wanted to -- we have got some questions that we are being asked about how the fairness hearing will be handled, and we have discussed among ourselves our own thoughts about -- or suggestions on some of the issues that occurred to us, but recognizing that, you know, it's a hundred percent up to the Court, and we're -- will offer our thoughts about issues we flagged and our thoughts on those, but understanding it will be handled however the Court wants to handle it.

The information that we're providing -- that we are going to provide, which I would anticipate being filed with final approval papers probably late in the day

Monday, so probably after close of business -- but there are two charts that we're pulling together. One is a list of the people that have, consistent with the

Court's -- with the procedures the Court provided in the notice, have indicated -- have provided notice that they would like to speak at the hearing, and I can tell you there -- our current understanding is that there are -- there are six, I guess what I would say, class representative farms that are planning to speak, but

that includes -- one of those farms are the Haars, as you will remember from the last hearing, three of the Haars spoke at the hearing, so, you know, depending on how one wants to look at it, you can either look at it as eight people speaking or six farms, but -- so that's one cluster.

The other cluster are people who have indicated they intend to speak who are not class representatives, and our current count is that that is -- there are an additional 23 people, although I think -- my understanding is that there are letters that have been received that have not yet been docketed, so I think the number may actually be closer to about 30, but we will try to have that all figured out by Monday and get that information to the Court. We will file it as a pleading with the list of who falls into these two groups. You will have a list in front of you, part of our thinking on that.

The second thing we are pulling together is just -is a chart that has all -- that will list all the
letters. I don't know the sequence they are listed in.
It may be by docket number. I don't know. But it will
list them all, and it will indicate -- you know, it will
have a column that identifies whether someone supports
the settlement, whether someone is objecting to the

settlement, or whether someone has opted out of the class. So we will provide that information, I think, in a granular way in the chart and we will also give you an aggregate so you will know the totals.

So that -- is there any questions about that?

That's the information we will submit, and then I can talk about the issues that have occurred to us.

THE COURT: Okay. So you can continue to provide information if you want. I can tell you how I think it should unfold. Whatever you want to do next.

MR. PIERSON: All right. Well, maybe I should go ahead and give you our sort of preliminary -- well, the issues that occurred to us, and I will just flag them and then we will listen to how you want to handle it.

So, you know, the biggest concern that we have been talking through is just the number of people and how the mix -- we understand from the prior proceedings, you know, the Court has been very generous with people, letting people speak at these hearings, and so that sort of is our going-in assumption. And we're trying to figure out how to get that done.

There's one other consideration which I know is important to -- that a number of farmers have communicated with -- and some other lawyers can speak to

this if they need to, but the number of farmers that 1 2 have expressed, you know, strong feelings to us that it's important to them that -- if that it's possible, 3 that we get this done -- that we get at least their part 4 5 of it done in one day. So that has been -- so we 6 thought about how that could be accomplished. And the 7 concern on the part of the farmers is that some of them 8 are traveling a good distance, it's the planting season, and so we are hoping when they show up they will have 9 10 the chance to speak. 11 THE COURT: But it isn't Rutland Dairy Days or 12 anything, is it? It's not Rutland Dairy Day? 13 MR. PIERSON: Excuse me? THE COURT: It's not Rutland Dairy Day or 14 Vermont Dairy Day or anything that we are going to have 15 16 this hearing? Remember that came up last time? 17 MR. PIERSON: Your Honor, I think that -- oh, go ahead, Danny. 18 MR. SMITH: Yeah, this is Danny Smith. 19 20 think you are safe this time, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 22 MR. PIERSON: No, the issue is just they are 23 in the planting season, and so we are trying to do the 24 best we can to accommodate them. But here are what we

talked about, and I do want to just reiterate that we

25

understand -- we're really honoring this in the spirit of take it for what it's worth, and we will do -- do whatever the Court wants us to.

You know, we talked about whether it might make sense to start the hearing at nine a.m. instead of 10, and if we -- and how we could provide notice if we do that, which we think we are able to do.

One of the things we had talked about is -- the possibility would be to have the class representatives speak in the morning, and, you know, how much time they would all have would be obviously up to the Court, but we thought that if we had the class reps speak in the morning, and then had all the other farmers that had provided notice -- you know, had provided notice they intend to speak, speak in the afternoon, and our understanding is that with those farmers in general, I think our expectation would be that they're planning to speak, you know, relatively short duration most of them, five or 10 minutes. It's not probably true of all the class reps, but it's probably true of the rest of the farmers.

But our thought was that if we broke it down that way, that -- that all the farmers that had indicated an intention to speak ought to be able to speak in that day. Our assumption, again up to the Court, was that --

I mean, there are a number of groups of lawyers here. There's the -- you know, the DFA/DMS subclass. There's the non-DFA/DMS subclass. There's the defendants. That probably for the lawyers to do what we ought to do and to answer all the Court's questions, that that -- probably two hours is reasonable for that. But it obviously does not have to occur on Friday. I think from our point of view it's more important to let the farmers who want to speak, speak.

And I think the only other issue that we had -there are sort of two other issues that we had talked
about that I should flag. One is, you know, there's
some concern -- because we know there're organized
efforts to get farmers there, and if we -- you know,
we're told there's, you know, like a bus load of farmers
that may come. We wanted to be sure that the people
that have provided notice to speak actually are able to
get into the courtroom, because there is some
possibility of crowd -- of a crowd.

And the one other issue, which I will just flag and then I will stop, is we have received questions from individuals, and I know other attorneys have received questions from individuals who are not class members either because they were never class members or they have opted out, but they are not class members, and they

haven't provided notice of an intention to speak, and basically the question was -- what was raised was should they show up, are they going to be able to speak anyway? And we just wanted to know if there's any guidance about what we ought to tell them on that.

So that's kind of our list, your Honor, and thanks for your patience.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't think we should start early. I think that we are going to need to get people through security, and it's just not going to work to move it up. And I want to avoid any conspiracy theory that the hearing is engineered to prevent people from X, Y or Z. I am just not going to go there. So we are going to start when we are going to start.

This is their fairness hearing, so I don't think I need two hours from the attorneys. Judges don't see that as the focus of a fairness hearing. This -- I have heard from you, you know. I will be very conversant with your papers, and if there's time, that's one thing, but this is for the purpose of class members to either support or object to the settlement, and that's really what I want to hear.

I am not really thinking that I would need another day, and I think that would feed into the conspiracy theory, to hear from the attorneys. So if something is

so disturbing that you need to respond in writing thereafter, that's fine. I don't plan on that happening, but, you know, if it happens, it happens.

I was going to limit the speakers to who actually followed the rules. Most of these people have already been through a fairness hearing, so they can't claim "I didn't know that, you know, this is how it went" and "I didn't understand what was going to happen."

This is -- we have had a dress rehearsal, and I am going to be less amenable to having people speak because they do understand what the process is, and there's just too many of them.

I was planning on limiting everybody, including class representatives because they really shouldn't have a different status than class members, to five minutes and keeping fairly religiously to that number. And so I didn't expect -- I mean, they have got an opportunity for written objections, and it's just not conceivable that we would have long diatribes or explanations, but we will see how that works.

And with that as the number, I thought we could probably get it in on one day, and if we can't, people are going to have to come back. But five minutes is actually a fair amount of time to say this is what I like, this is what I don't like, and I will provide

guidance. I'm good at redirecting people, as you know, when I think somebody is going off track and talking about things that the Court can't resolve. I will try to direct it to the settlement. So that's kind of what I was thinking.

In terms of if we have a class representative and they are husband and wife or father and son, I would expect that each of them could speak. I don't think people's children should be able to speak, so I don't want class members to get bumped out by nonclass members. And so, for example, I think the Haars should be able to speak. I don't know that we need to hear from their son. You know, I don't know that we are going to have enough time for that.

So I am going to be fairly mindful that the purpose is to give class members an opportunity to speak, and it's less about the lawyers and the class representatives because you have already told me what their positions are.

MR. PIERSON: That all seems fine to me, your Honor. I will let other counsel weigh in, but that all seems quite workable to me.

THE COURT: Anybody think that's not going to be workable or would be -- and you should be candid because we are still in the forming stage -- unfair,

arbitrary, capricious, any of those things? 1 MR. ABRAMS: Your Honor, this is Bob Abrams. 2 And I -- I was happy to hear all your comments and 3 proceed in the manner that you said. And I think it's 4 5 helpful to us in answering questions as well that we're 6 getting. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, this is Danny Smith. If I could just ask two questions --9 10 THE COURT: Sure. MR. SMITH: -- along that line. 11 12 So if I understand, the basic point is, we get a 13 call, somebody says, "I didn't get my notice in in 14 time," the answer is that only folks who did get their 15 notices in in time will be authorized to speak? 16 THE COURT: Yes. MR. SMITH: And second question, more mundane, 17 18 recommendation as to what time folks should show up with 19 that anticipated number of participants given the 20 security based on your experience? 21 THE COURT: So our court security starts 22 screening at eight, so it won't happen any earlier than 23 that, but that's probably -- if you are here at eight, 24 you will have a seat in the courtroom. 25 MR. SMITH: Okay, very helpful. Thank you.

MR. KUNEY: Your Honor, this is Steve Kuney.

I have one question, if I may?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. KUNEY: I know it's been -- I know it's been an ordeal for the clerk's office to post all these filings. Where we find ourselves right now is that, you know, pursuant to the notice, people who intended to speak at the hearing were supposed to provide counsel with, you know, a cc. of their letter. We have a number of letters that we received that were mailed late last week that have not yet appeared on the court's docket. I don't know whether there's anything that we can or need or should do about that, but we believe they were timely filed and don't know whether the clerk has not completely caught up yet or whether there's something we should do to ensure that they don't lose out.

THE COURT: So the whole thing is a predicament in that we're getting lots and lots of paper, and rather than making a judicial determination as to is this a class member, is it timely, what should I do about it, we have just been -- and some of them aren't signed -- we have been docketing them as they -- as the clerk's office can come -- you know, through the package, and they are going to show up on the docket. That's just the easiest way to do it. It's consistent

with my policy of openness. 1 2 We have had a couple requests for in camera 3 inspection. I have explained that's not the way we are 4 going to proceed. So that's the best I can do with the paper coming in is it will show up on the docket. 5 6 MR. KUNEY: Very well. Thank you, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Anything else? 8 MR. PIERSON: I don't think so, your Honor. 9 Again, thank you for hearing us on short notice. THE COURT: Okay. No problem. We'll see you 10 11 soon. 12 (Court was in recess at 3:55 p.m.) 13 14 15 16 17 CERTIFICATION 18 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 19 20 21 June 5, 2016 Anne Nichols Pierce Date 22 23 2.4 25